

"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—CHRIST.

The Christian Freeman.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL.

DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

No. 2.]

FEBRUARY, 1859.

[PRICE 1½d.

SHE IS GONE.

A PLEA FOR SANITARY REFORM.

JUST opposite our house—stop a minute—there is music in those two last words—let us say them again. How sweet they sound—once more—there is a great hill opposite where we are sitting, repeating these two words, and here they come again. Echo is over there in the deep shade of the trees in that valley, and it says, *our house*. Well, just opposite our house there is an alley or court, leading away up somewhere behind the houses, where there are other houses—tenant houses—holes for human beings to suffocate in. We have never been up there, but we know that those who live by labor, and have to labor to live, are up there; for often of an evening we see one of the tenants come home with his dray, and he unhitches his horse by the pump outside, and then he turns away and says "Come," and walks up the little court with his faithful and tried servant at his heels, and for a long time we wondered if they both lodged in the same house, or, if not, where did he lodge his horse? So we went over one day as he was going up, and peeped into the court, and there we saw the man open a little side door, into which, after shedding off his harness, for there was not room for anything but his body—the horse crowded himself, and then the man opened another little door above his head—nay, the other extreme—and there, in a little cuddly hole, where under the bed he had a bag of oats—we know it was under the bed, for we saw the dust on his knees where he had knelt down to fill the little measure, for which he got more whined thanks from a good servant, a faithful friend, and grateful animal, though it was a dumb beast.

So day after day, for months and years, we have seen the same man and the same horse—latterly, the horse walks as though getting to feel his age and hard work, and the man looks care-worn and tired of long toil that brings him nothing but a lodging in that same hot oven, near where he boxes up his horse to sweat and stew all night—brings him only a small loaf of bread—they are very small now-a-days—for his whole family. Yes, it brings him something else—did bring him something else—every night when he came home, it brought a little girl about ten years old, with the prettiest, soft, red hair—we have no great fondness for red hair generally, but this was pretty—bounding like a fawn down the court and up on the dray, just before it got to the pump, where it had to stop; it could not go by, for the old horse had stopped there so long he could not go beyond that certain fixed stopping-place. It was a short ride, but a merry one; 'twas childhood's happy hour.

Our man was an early riser, up and away often before we were dressed, but early as it was, the bright red curls were there, and she would bound up on the dray and cling to one she loved for one more kiss, and perchance a ride to the next corner, and then back at a double quick step to the door-step of the house next "our alley," to catch a last look and send a last kiss upon the magnetic telegraph of a waving hand, with a "good-by, papa," as he went down the corner, and away to his work down town. Often for two hours before sun-down she would sit down upon that door-step, watching the same corner for the expected one, for sometimes he came at an early hour; and then she came to meet him with more joy in her eye, and more in his

than all that was ever felt by one who never heard the sound of "Oh! there comes Papa." Sometimes she had company; a tall, graceful, neat woman, with a pale face and frail person, who stood by her, looking in the same direction. It was a good place, too, in the shade of some dark green trees, where she came out of that court, where she breathed hot air all day, and carbonic acid gas all night, to get a snuff of the evening breeze, coming up from the lower bay. That breeze is a blessed inheritance of the poor, which they should enjoy, but are cheated out of it by every one who builds their houses.

One evening we noticed that our little girl of the alley over the way was not alone in her usual seat upon the doorstep. In her lap lay a little sister, very young, small, and pale as her mother, with her mother's own sweet face. Every pleasant evening for months, that little girl brought "the baby" down the court, out into the open street, to feel the soft air of the sea breeze. She could not run to meet papa, but her eyes went round the corner in sharp glances, and she tried to direct baby's the same way, as she said, "there comes papa." So, as she could not run to meet him, as soon as he turned old Dobbin about toward the pump, before he stopped to unhitch, he jumped off, and came and stooped down and kissed both. Of their life in in-doors, we knew nothing, but one so affectionate to his children must have been equally so to the mother who bore them. We could have sworn to it often, that he was a kind, good husband, when we saw the market basket upon his arm, or the slop-bucket in his hand, and the little bits of kindling wood on his cart—all kindling the fires of affection in the heart, as well as the household fire in that room where all lived and cooked, and ate and slept.

Oh, what a pity, we often thought, that such industry could not bring a better reward. Out in the country, in some snug farm-house, how the color would come back to that mother's cheek—for it was there that she was born—and those two children would grow up to a healthy womanhood.

A few days ago we went out of the city; it was one of those burning days

of that hot month of July. Out in the country—in shady groves and in deep nooks, by cool springs gushing out of the rocks, we saw scores of city children, that live in just such courts as the carman and his little red-headed daughter; and they were so happy, and it gave life such a healthy joy, that we wished she, too, could have been there. Strange, though we had never spoken to this gentle child; what a cord went from our heart to hers!

We came back the next day, but we did not see her. Morning and evening passed, and she was not there. And then we thought, yes, we felt, that she had gone to the country; perhaps, just then was sitting with father and mother under the shade of just such a group of fragrant cedars, on just such a rock, near just such a spring, as we had sat by just two days before, with one of the dearest little girls in the world, while other little girls, more inclined to play, were enjoying life with high glee all around.

We were almost sure our surmise was true, because the cart stood idle in the street; but it only stood there two days, and then we saw old Dobbin backing out of his oven, and coming down the alley, and walking in between the shafts of the cart by the pump. It was an old familiar sight, and we really felt comfortable to see it again. We thought the carman's eyes looked a little unusually red, and there was less vigor in his step than ought to follow two days' recreation in the country: and we could not help thinking that he had done what a million others of his countrymen had done,—got drunk. How we did wrong that man. After he was all ready to start, he got down and went back, and looked up the court, as though he had forgotten something, or expected to see somebody running down. Why did not somebody come? But she did not, and he started away, looking back as he went round the corner; but no loving glance met his; no kiss flew from a hand, like an electric shock to his heart. What could it mean? Ah, thought we, he has left them in the country. Grandpa fell so in love with the city girl, that he must have her stay a while with him, and grandma thinks it must be too hot for the baby in the city,

and mamma's health will be all the better for a week there.

All true, yet all false. It was so true it served for a lull of any anxiety in our mind, until Saturday; and then somebody at our house wanted a cart, and called him of the opposite alley. While he was waiting, we said, "we supposed he went to the country to enjoy the Fourth of July."

"No, it was a day of but little enjoyment to me."

"Were you sick?"

"No."

There was a strange suspicion coming over us. We dreaded to ask for fear it was true, but could not turn away, so we said:

"And your little girl?"

"She is gone, sir."

"To the country?"

"Yes."

We breathed freer, until he added:—

"Yes, she has gone to the country—to Greenwood!"

"And the little one."

"It went with her. We could not part them. Her last words were, 'Oh, take good care of the baby till I come for it. It won't be long; good-bye!' She died at evening—she came for her 'pet' at dawn, and we laid it upon her breast, and carried them both out together. You have missed her, too. I have often noticed you looking at us. But she is gone now."

"And the mother?"

"She will soon follow, I fear, and then I shall be alone."

He turned to wipe away manly, honest tears, and we—well, no matter. We went and sat down at our desk, took up a sheet and wrote those three words that were ringing in our brain, and burning in our heart—"She is gone"—and then—well, we did not write what followed—we only held the pen, while we were only conscious of one thing—had but one thought—all else was absorbed in those words—"She is gone." Gone from that close, confined court, where she breathed hot air all day, and carbonic acid gas all night. Oh! had she had the fresh breeze, which should be the blessed inheritance of the poor as well as the rich, we might not have been narrating this sorrowful tale of health, youth, and beauty, so soon gone from our midst.—*New York Tribune.*

EXCLUDING UNITARIANS, ROMAN CATHOLICS, ETC., FROM CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS.

BY MR. JOHN BROWNE,

Member of the Gospel Diffusion Church.

[A short time ago, "A Young Men's Christian Association" was formed in Newcastle-on-Tyne. At their first public meeting a question was put which provoked an animated discussion, as to whether "young men of Christian character," holding Unitarian, Roman Catholic, &c. sentiments, would be admitted as members. An appeal to the meeting produced a decided negative. The Secretary, Mr. Taylor, wrote to the *Northern Daily Express*, defending the decision, and defining the word "Christian." Mr. Browne wrote the following letter in reply, but it was not admitted.—*Ed. Christian Freeman.*]

Mr. Taylor says, in defence of this exclusion, "the words 'Christian' and 'unsectarian' are to be taken in the sense in which they would be understood by the majority of evangelical Christians." Now, what Mr. Taylor means by "evangelical Christians" would perhaps be more unmistakably expressed by the words *Protestant Trinitarians*. An *evangelical* Christian is one who follows Christ as he is revealed to us in the evangelical, or Gospel history of his life and teachings. But the Unitarian and Roman Catholic, equally with the Trinitarian and Protestant, believe that they so follow Christ, and have equal claims to the title.

Now, what the *majority* of Protestant Trinitarians understand by the word "Christians," is "all who think as we think," which is proved by the fact that it is proposed the "Evangelical Alliance"—new association—shall exclude from its *angelic* pale all *un-evangelical* Christians—Unitarians, Roman Catholics, and members of the Society of Friends. I would ask Mr. Taylor "is it wise—is it politic to perpetuate such narrow exclusiveness by forming another society upon such a niggardly basis?" Cannot Roman Catholicism point to a Quesnel, a Thomas-a Kempis, a Fenelon, a Pascal, and ask, "Were not these Christians?" Cannot Quakerism point to its Penn, its Fox, its Fry, and numbers of a like character, and demand, "Were not these followers of Christ?" And even Unitarianism has its stars in the Christian hemisphere. The ablest defenders of

Christianity against the attacks of its opponents in the last century, and from whom its present defenders draw their most cogent arguments, were Unitarians. "Assuredly," says Lord Brougham, "they (the errors of Unitarians) are not to be corrected by denying that Sir Isaac Newton, who it is quite certain was a Unitarian, was a Christian; or Dr. Lardner,—he to whose writings in defence of religion Christianity owes so great an obligation, that they form a large proportion, nay, the foundation of Dr. Paley's celebrated work." Were not Milton, Locke, Carpenter, and Blanco White of our own country, and Norton, Channing, Ware, etc., of America, Christians? These were men who, for devoutness of heart, for patient research, and eloquence in the defence and enforcement of Christianity, as they understood it, have not been surpassed. To such men who would deny the Christian name. "I was exceedingly struck," says John Wesley, "at reading the following life [of Firmin]; having long settled it in my mind that the entertaining wrong notions concerning the Trinity was inconsistent with real piety. But I cannot argue against matter-of-fact. I dare not deny that Mr. Firman was a pious man, although his notions of the Trinity were quite erroneous."

Of Dr. Carpenter, of Bristol, the *Eclectic Review* says, " . . . when such a character is presented to our view, it would warrant the suspicion of an obtuse understanding, or, what is worse, a cold heart, not to resemble Barnabas, 'who, when he came and saw the grace of God, was glad; for he was a good man, and full of the Holy Spirit and of faith.' . . . It was scarcely possible for an upright person to know Dr. Carpenter, and not to love and venerate him." See also Dr. Pye Smith's references to Dr. Carpenter, in his *Scripture Testimonies*. "We have no sympathy with the distinguishing elements in the creed of Henry Ware; we believe it to be unscriptural; yet, when we see constantly appearing his self-condemnation, his sense of unworthiness, his reverence of God, his efforts to do good to men's souls, his submission to the most painful allotments of Providence, his calmness and joy in the pros-

pect of death, following on an unusually spotless and serious life, we cannot find it in our heart to condemn him because he followeth not us."—*Christian Review*. "Mrs. Ware's religious life was pure and unspotted; and, had she lived in a warmer atmosphere of Christian feeling, she would have been a model, besides, of Christian experience."—*Methodist Quarterly Review*. "The memoir of Mrs. Ware 'is a beautiful life of a beautiful character. . . . We commend it most cordially to our readers. . . . We could wish that many who profess a sounder and more consistent creed adorned their course by a character and life half as consistent as were those of Mrs. Ware.'" "Channing must, in fact, be admitted to have been either a saint or a hypocrite; and the man who is prepared to say he was a hypocrite, may be assured that he is not much unfitted to be one himself."—*Methodist Quarterly Review*. These are all testimonies, from "evangelical" writers, to the Christian character of professed Unitarians. Surely he must be a bold man who could publish to the world that the term Christian implies anything which could exclude such from Christian society.

"When I look," says Bishop Hampden, "at the reception, by the Unitarians, both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, sternly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge the basis of Divine fact the name of Christian. Who, indeed, is justified in denying the title to any one who professes to love Christ in sincerity." "A Unitarian," says Dr. Arnold, "as such, is a Christian; that is, if a man follows Christ's law, and believes His words, according to his conscientious convictions of their meaning, he is a Christian; and though I may think he understands Christ's words amiss, yet that is a question of interpretation, and no more. The purpose of his heart and mind is to obey and be guided by Christ, and, therefore, he is a Christian." Who has constituted us arbitrators of Christ's law on earth? What right have we to exclude from His society on earth those whom, from their life, we have every reason to believe He acknowledges, and will be accepted in the last day, when the secrets of their hearts will be made

known? "For I can never believe," and no man of any extended range of Christian thought, "that a man may not be saved by that religion which doth but bring him to a true love of God, and to a heavenly mind and life, nor that God will ever cast a soul to hell that truly loveth him." John Pounds, of Portsmouth, was a Unitarian, yet of him Dr. Thomas Guthrie has said, "When the day comes when honour will be done to whom honour is due, I can fancy the crowd of those whose fame poets have sung, and to whose memory monuments have been raised, divided like a wave; and, passing the great, and the noble, and the mighty of the land, this poor, obscure old man, stepping forward and receiving the especial notice of Him who said, 'Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these, ye did it also to me.'" Are we to deny Christian love and fellowship to those who do not accept, from want of conscientious convictions, of the truth of those doctrines which we think peculiar to Christianity? Protestantism, in Mr. Taylor, I presume, admits the right of private judgment, yet rejects and persecutes, the inevitable consequences resulting from such a principle. He abhors Roman Catholicism, yet receives, cherishes, and defends the intolerant spirit which is said to belong to it. The Lord Jesus rejected none on account of wrong belief, except when that belief was the consequence of an "evil heart." Jeremy Taylor says, "A good man that believes what, according to his light, and upon the use of his moral industry, he thinks true, whether he hits upon the right or not—because he hath a mind desirous of truth, and prepared to believe every truth—is, therefore, acceptable to God." "I think you will find that all 'false doctrines,' spoken of by the apostles, are doctrines of sheer wickedness; that their counterpart in modern times is to be found in the Anabaptists of Munster, or the Fifth Monarchy men, or in mere secular high churchmen, or hypocritical evangelicals—in those who make Christianity minister to lust, or to covetousness, or to ambition: not in those who interpret Scripture to the best of their conscience and ability, be their interpretation ever so erroneous." Who can tell

us, *ex cathedra*, what are the precise ideas to be entertained in the doctrine of the Trinity? or of the atonement? You, Mr. Editor, don't need to be told that among authors of acknowledged ability, and undoubted orthodoxy, difference in opinion is very wide. Think of the rage of controversy between Drs. William Sherlock and South on the former doctrine, both members of the same community. What diversity existed on the latter doctrine! Calvin, Watts, and Harvey differed from the Synod of Dort. Gilbert and Pye Smith from all of them. Some differ as to its nature; others as to its extent—and some in both. Yet this is all ORTHODOX, and persons holding such opinions are eligible for admission to the projected Society; whilst a devout Romanist, though a Pascal; a Unitarian, though a Channing; a member of the Society of Friends, though a Barclay, would be pharisaically rejected. Such may be called *evangelical* Christianity, but it is a misnomer. Christ-like it is not. "Simon, son of Jonas, thinkest thou as I think?" That is not Christ's voice. But, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?" Let the new society, if it pretends to the name of Christian, adopt the same rule, and we shall recognise in it the voice and practice of Christ, and it will be worthy of the name.

If we are afraid of losing what we have of truth, by admitting Roman Catholics and Unitarians, it is an evidence that we already doubt our truth, and believe a little in their error. The sooner we admit them the better, that we may be forced to examine our foundations, and, if false, to abandon them and look around. If we have confidence in the truth we hold, and in the omnipotence of that truth, let us admit those who are in error, that they may get all the good we have. Why "eat our morsel alone?" By imparting a little of our light it will grow brighter. They can do us no harm. Truth is always an antidote to error. We can surely discuss our differences in a Christian spirit, free from the rancour of debate; at least, we can discuss the differences between "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy," as calmly as we can discuss the difference in "orthodoxy" itself. There has been more—far more—bitterness in past time in

discussing "orthodox" differences, than in the discussion of the most obnoxious tenets of the most "heterodox" sect in Christendom. If we cannot Christianly examine our principles, we are not deserving to be called "young men of Christian character." The truth we have is of no use to us. It is not worth a straw in the arena of conflict with error. Satan has as much, and more. It is the mere shell and corpse, without heart and soul. "Love is not perfected in us." Others have benefitted by Unitarian society, why should not we? "At least three-quarters of my time have been spent among writers of the Unitarian class, from whom I have received, with gratitude, much instruction, etc."—*Moses Stuart*. "Neither of their heresies, nor of far greater than theirs, have I the least dread. I have no alarm for the truth,—no fear of error. Let truth be left to the attack of its enemies, error to the care of its friends, and I have no apprehension of the result. But one thing I do fear; one thing does alarm me; and that is, *persecuted error*."—*Brougham*.

To the Unitarian, Mr. Taylor says, he would say the term Christian implies "a belief that God was *in* Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." These words of Paul exactly express the Unitarian belief! Before Mr. Taylor attempted to shut Unitarians out of the new Society, by such a definition, it would have become him to have inquired what is their faith. He ought not to imagine that he is such an adept at Christian polemics as to be able to un-Christianize, to say the least, one of the most intelligent denominations with a single dash of his pen. Let me tell Mr. Taylor that the Unitarians believe with the moderate Calvinist, and Arminians, after Paul, that God was and is, "*in, through, or by* Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

Mr. Taylor says, "I would say to the Catholic the word Christian implies belief in Christ as the *only* Mediator;" since the word "Mediator" is not of confined import. Mr. Taylor should have told us what it "implies." It may mean, *one who pacifies by sacrifice*, an interpreter, or an intercessor, etc. In the first sense, the "Catholic" would

agree with him. If in the sense of *interpreter*, of God to man,—in this sense the Catholic would also agree, Jesus *only* was the express image of the Father; he *only* "hath declared Him;" he *only* could say, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father also." But if, in the sense of *intercessor*, then the "Catholic" would disagree with Mr. Taylor, and be in good company. The Apostle exhorts that "intercessions be made (*by Christians*) for all men." If, in the sense of the departed, praying, or interceding for us, the Apostle does not forbid this. May not the Catholic *naturally* suppose that, if he could ask his friend when present in the body to pray for him, he may ask him now? And if God is supposed to "hearken and hear" the embodied, may he not be supposed to regard the desires of the *dis-embodied*? at least, the thought is innocent and beautiful.

Errors of opinion, simply, will not exclude men from the society of the blest in heaven. We may make the grounds of acceptance to societies here as stringent as we please; our blind zeal will not influence the decisions of the everlasting King. "*The pure in heart shall see God*." This one sentence scatters like chaff all the creeds that Synods and Councils ever made. "He that worships God most spiritually," says David Simpson, "and obeys him most universally, believing in the name of his only begotten Son, is the best man, and most acceptable to the Divine Being, whether he be found in a church, in a Quaker's meeting-house, in a dissenting place of worship of any other description, or upon the top of a mountain." "In every nation," and among all denominations, "he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him." And, if God will accept, why should not man? "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but a new creature." "Grace be with all them," says the Apostle, "that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." No, says the *Evangelical Alliance* and kindred societies, who believe in the narrow prejudices of the Venerable Bede: "Unhappy men, they don't keep Easter our way."

A GENUINE 'APOSTLES' CREED,

"Expressed in their words in the Book of 'Acts.'

"I BELIEVE IN 'THE FATHER' (ch. i. 33); 'the living GOD which made heaven and earth, the sea, and all things that are therein' (ch. xiv. 15); unto whom 'are known all His works from the beginning of the world' (ch. xv. 18); who 'hath determined the times before appointed' (ch. xvii. 26); who 'dwelleth not in temples made with hands' (ch. vii. 48, xvii. 24); and 'who is not far from every one of us, for in HIM we live, and move, and have our being' (ch. xvii. 27, 28).

"I believe in 'JESUS OF NAZARETH, a man approved of GOD by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which GOD did by him' (ch. ii. 22); 'who went about doing good, * * * for GOD was with him' (ch. x. 38); whom 'GOD hath made both Lord and Christ' (ch. ii. 36); whom 'GOD exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour' (ch. v. 31); 'against whom were gathered together both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel' (ch. iv. 27); who 'crucified' him (ch. ii. 36); 'whom GOD raised from the dead' (ch. iii. 15); who 'was taken up into heaven' (ch. i. 11); whom 'GOD hath glorified' (ch. iii. 13); who now 'standeth on the right hand of GOD' (ch. vii. 55); and who 'is ordained of GOD to be the Judge of quick and dead.

"I believe in the HOLY SPIRIT; that it is 'the gift of GOD' (ch. viii. 20); with which Jesus was 'anointed' (ch. x. 38); which was 'shed forth' (ch. ii. 33) on the Twelve on 'the day of Pentecost' (ch. ii. 1); and which was 'given' to believers through laying on of the Apostles' 'hands.'

"I believe that SALVATION is promised to all who 'believe in the Lord Jesus Christ' (ch. xvi. 31); and 'repent, and turn to GOD, and do works meet for repentance' (ch. xxvi. 20).

"I believe 'that there shall be a RESURRECTION of the dead, both of the just and unjust' (ch. xxiv. 15); and that 'GOD hath appointed a day in the which HE will JUDGE the world in righteousness by that man whom HE hath ordained' (ch. xvii. 31). AMEN."—*Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan.*

We have reprinted the two foregoing articles, *Excluding Unitarians, and Genuine Apostles Creed*, and will send, *post-free*, any number of them, at the rate of Two Shillings per hundred. Orders not to be sent after the 20th instant.

THE BURNS CENTENARY.

JUST while the name of Burns! Burns! Burns! is buzzing in our ears—have patience with us in our weakness for being drawn into the whirlpool—to add to the din, by a few words of ours, and a few lines of his, which our readers "may either say or sing." First, then, he was not devoid of Religious feeling and sentiment of the purest kind. His father was a good, religious man, and this is a picture of home.

Then kneeling down to HEAVEN'S ETERNAL KING

The saint, the father, and the husband prays—

Hope springs exulting on triumphant wing,

That thus they all shall meet in future days:

There ever bask in uncreated rays,

No more to sigh or shed the bitter tear,

Together hymning their Creator's praise,

In such society, yet still more dear

While circling time moves round in an eternal sphere.

Compared with this, how poor Religion's pride,

In all the pomp of method and of art,

When men display to congregations wide,

Devotions every grace except the heart!

The Power incensed the pagant will desert,

The pompous strain, the sacerdotal stole;

But haply, in some cottage far apart,

May hear, well pleased, the language of the soul;

And in *His Book of Life* the inmates poor enrol.

Long will "Cottar's Saturday Night" speak the praise of Burns. Can it be that this poem will ever be forgotten. We cannot refrain from jotting down these pure lines of prayer:

O THOU unknown Almighty cause

Of all my hope and fear!

In whose dread presence, ere an hour,

Perhaps I must appear.

If I have wandered in those paths

Of life I ought to shun:

As something loudly in my breast,

Remonstrates I have done.

Where with intention I have erred,

No other plea I have.

But Thou art good; and goodness still;

Delighteth to forgive.

He has a word in season for "*The Unco Guid and the Rigidly Righteous*," with a sprinkling of deep philosophy as well as common sense and a plea for Christian charity.

O ye wha are sae guid yoursel,

Sae pious and sae holy,

Ye've nought to do but mark and tell

Your neebour's faults and folly.

Ye high exalted virtuous dames,

Ty'd up in godly laces,

Before ye gie poor frailty names

Suppose a change o' cases.

Then gently scan your brother man,

Still gentler sister woman,

Tho' they may gang a kennin wrang,

To step aside is human.

One point must still be greatly dark,

The moving why they do it;

And just as lamely can ye mark,

How far, perhaps, they rue it.

Who made the heart, 'tis He alone,

Decidedly can try us;

He knows each chord---its various tone,

Each spring---its various bias:

Then at the balance let's be mute,

We never can adjust it;

What's done we partly may compute,

But know not what's resisted.

He certainly abuses the devil with many an uncouth name; but, after all, he wishes him in his last verse better fare than many of Old Clottie's enemies dare. He rather reminds one of Crusoe's Man Friday, in this reformatory idea of the devil.

But, fare ye weel, and Nickie-ben!
O wad ye tak' a thought and men!
Ye sibblins might—I dinna ken—
Still hae a stake—
I'm wae to think upon your den,
E'en for your sake.

Burns shows no quarter to Calvinism. It must be bad, to be in its very midst, and not respect it one bit. He says of M—y's flock:

Sae hale and hearty every shank,
Nae poisoned sour Arminian stank,
He let them taste,
Frae Calvin's well, aye clear they drank.
O sic a feast.

He can never be forgiven, among the rigid Calvinists, for "*Holy Willie's Prayer*." They say it is a slander, and so it is, if the following definition of slander be true. "Donald," said a Scotch dame, looking up from the Catechism to her son; "What's a slander?" "A slander, gude mither?" quoth young Donald, twisting the corner of his plaid; "A-weel, I hardly ken, unless it be mayhap an ower true tale, which one gude person tells of anither." The following is a slander on Calvinism. Donald's dictionary explains it.

Oh thou, wha in the heavens dost dwell,
Wha, as it pleases best thyself,
Sends aye to heaven and ten to hell,
A' for thy glory;
And no for aye guid or ill
They've done afore them.

What was I, or my generation,
That I should get such exaltation;
I wha deserve sic just damnation,
For broken laws,
Five thousand years' fore my creation,
Thro' Adam's cause.

It is very clear that Burns was disgusted at that howl against common sense, in matters of religion. Unsparringly in "*Holy Fair*," and his "*Dedication to Gavin Hamilton*," he attacks those who attack moral preaching, and are all for faith. Soon as the preaching takes a moral turn, he writes:

But hark! the tent has changed its voice;
There's peace and rest nae langer;
For a' the real judges rise,
They canna sit for anger.

What signifies this barren shine
Of moral powers and reason;
His English style and gesture fine,
Are a' clean out o' season.

Like *Socrates* or *Antoine*,
Or some Auld Pagan Heathen,
The moral man he does define,
But ne'er a word o' faith in.

We are forcibly reminded here of the *Standard's* discovery of *heresy*, in the Bishop of London's sermon, a few weeks ago. The defects of the Bishop's sermon, writes the critic, are the *want of sound faith*. "The utter ruin of human nature . . . the atoning sacrifice . . . justification by faith . . . imputation of Christ's righteousness . . . these were points

which, with the exception of a loose and solitary phrase or two, had no place in the discourse. Nearly every word of it might have been uttered by a Jewish Rabbi or a Unitarian minister." It would have been an embellishment if the critic had said, "or some Auld Pagan Heathen" might have preached as well as the Bishop.

Burns says on this topic so sarcastically:

Morality, thou deadly bane,
Thy tens o' thousands thou hast slain;
Vain is his hope whose stay and trust is
In moral mercy, truth, and justice.
No—stretch a point to catch a plack;
Abuse a brother to his back;
Be to the poor like onie whunstane,
Aye haud their noses to the grunstone;
Ply every art of legal thieving;
No matter—stick to sound believing,
Learn three mile prayers, and half mile graces,
Wi weel spread loaves, an' lang wry faces;
Grunst up a solemn lengthened groan,
And dam a' parties but your own.
I'll warrant then you're nae deceiver,
A steady, sturdy, STAUNCH BELIEVER.

In Burns's time the cry of heresy was raised, for in Ayr many of the ministers had read Dr. Taylor's works, and they began to be bitterly reviled. Burns comes out in defence of this heretical tendency, in the "*Kirk's Alarm*."

Orthodox, orthodox, wha believe in John Knox,
Let me sound an alarm to your conscience;
There's a heretic blast has been blawn in the wast,
That what is no sense, must be nonsense.

Calvin's sins, calvin's sins, seize your spiritual guns,
Ammunition ye never can need;
Your hearts are the stuff, will be powther enough,
And your skulls are storehouses o' lead.

D'rymple mild, D'rymple mild, tho' your heart's like a
And your life's like the new driven snaw, (child,
Yet that winna save ye, auld Satan must have ye,
For preaching that three's aye and twa [controverting
[the Trinity.

Dr. Mac, Dr. Mac, you should stretch on a rack,
To strike evil doers wi terror;
To join faith and sense upon any pretence,
Is heretic damnable error.

It is now very clear, whatever may have been Burns's virtues or defects, he was very heretical, when measured by the Calvinistic faith. And we know very well how the life of a man—a heretic—from time immemorial has been misconstrued, and hunted into wickedness. Morally speaking, we think, Burns may have been a much purer and better man than has been represented. He sinned against the orthodox faith in Scotland, and they had their revenge. We rejoice to find, now, all denominations joining to pay a tribute to his genius, sense, and worth, realising his prayer:

Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that;
That sense and worth o'er a' the earth
May victor be an a' that.
For a' that, and a' that,
Its coming yet for a' that,
That man to man the world o'er
Shall brothers be, for a' that.

"ROBERT BURNS and his Religious belief," a tract for the times, by M. Scott, Girvan, Ayr. On the receipt of 12 stamps, Mr. Scott, Unitarian minister, will send twelve copies to any part of the kingdom.

THE UNITARIAN CHURCH IN TRANSYLVANIA.

OUR Unitarian Churches in England are all of modern date compared with Unitarianism in Transylvania, a country in the eastern part of Europe, bordering on Turkey, and now subject, like all the principalities of Hungary, to Austria. No Protestant can sneer at our Unitarian brethren in Transylvania, and say ye are but of yesterday, for their history goes back to the days of the Reformation.

There are three names standing prominently before us, as the founders of the Unitarian cause in Transylvania:—George Blandrata, an eminent physician; Francis David, a man of the highest social rank and attainments; and John Sigismund, the King of Transylvania, under whose reign the doctrines of Luther, Calvin, and Unitarianism spread through that country. The King cast in his lot with the Unitarian reformers, and till his death, in 1571, the cause of general Protestantism greatly advanced among them. Since his time the religion of the country has been under the following divisions: Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Unitarians. No other religions have been allowed in Transylvania; for it is forbidden, under pain of confiscation of property and death, to introduce any new sect. We believe this is the law at the present, and that the followers of each of these sects are only allowed to make trifling alterations and reforms in their own churches. So much for religious liberty on the Continent.

It appears from the history of their church, that, from the beginning, they were Socinians, and, from ought we know to the contrary, are so now. For they seem to be under a law which enjoins on them "*The worship of Christ.*" This leads us to a painful part of their history, for all un-Scriptural enactments have had their pains and penalties affixed, and made some martyrs. Francis David, one of the founders, the most pious and learned of the three already named, after the death of Sigismund, took up his residence at Klausenberg, as superintendent of the Unitarian church. He soon discovered, by further study of the Scrip-

ture, that God the Father, only, was the object of Christian worship. This he asserted and recommended, which was considered as a daring innovation, and gave great offence to Blandrata. A new King had been elected, Bathori, a Catholic. Blandrata had aided the new King to this position, and stood high in the favour of the court. Blandrata had Faustus Socinus brought from Poland, to convince David of his error. Socinus failed, for David held there was no more authority for the worship of Christ than the worship of Angels, or the Virgin Mary. Blandrata then became the enemy of his old friend, denounced him to the King for his opposition to the laws of worship, and had him brought to trial. At this time David was so harrassed with the cares of the Church, the loss of his old friends, and a painful disease which was upon him, and persecution setting in upon him in so serious a manner; also, just previous to this, he had an apoplectic fit, so that he was unable to defend himself on his trial; in short, he could not speak, so sick and emaciated was he that day. He was condemned, and sent to the Castle of Deva, and thrown into a dungeon, where he soon finished his life. Religious bigotry is a cruel devil, among Unitarians, or Trinitarians, or wherever found. Well may we in England cast from us with indignation the name sometimes fastened on us, "*Socinians.*" They were Socinians who persecuted the true and pious David, a proper Unitarian, to death, in the dungeons of Deva. In their hands, in that age, we would have shared no better fate. We cannot doubt but the blood of this holy man will have its influence for good in the reformation of the Transylvanian Church.

When the persecution of the Polish Unitarians commenced, it drove great numbers of them to Transylvania, which greatly strengthened the church in that country. Though at different periods, since the rule of Austria triumphed in Transylvania, our brethren there have suffered much annoyance and persecution. The recent interference of Austria in their educational affairs is only a repetition of similar conduct manifested in past ages from that very paternal government, which has sold its body and soul

to Popery. In the year 1716 the Unitarians had their large church taken from them at Klausenberg, and given to the Roman Catholics. They were expelled from many of their churches, had their lands, and houses, and funds taken from them, and given to the Catholics. They were degraded from all public offices, and things went on in this way until 1780, then the Church had rest. By perseverance in their profession of faith, and their continued industry, they have gradually regained their former position and influence in the nation. Two wealthy Unitarian nobles, without family, since this robbery of their property, have bequeathed to them the whole of their substance.

We rejoice to hear that at present they are on the increase, and that their future prospects of efficiency of success are also hopeful. An evidence of their earnestness is the fact, that since the demand made on them by Austria, they have raised among themselves, though they are principally poor people, and their ministers have small salaries, they have raised £14,000 by taxing themselves about the one-eighth of their incomes, to increase the number of teachers, ministers, and professors, and to enable them to support the whole of their institutions still better than in the past. Their College is at Klausenberg, and the education is of so superior a kind, that one-third of the students belong to other religious denominations. Their churches throughout the country are principally modern structures, with a tower and belfry, and connected with them a school and teachers, as well as a minister and parsonage. There are, in all, 156 churches and 106 clergymen. The affairs of their churches are managed very similarly to our churches in England, by the minister and people. The stipend of the minister arises from a portion of land which belongs to each church, and the subscriptions of the people. In the year there are two general meetings of the heads of churches, for the general management of the whole body. Their religious services are conducted very similarly to the services among us in England. It was not until the year 1822 that they learned there were religious churches in England holding Unitarian sentiments. They had

kept on in their even course, conscious of the religious truthfulness of their views, imagining themselves alone in this profession of the Unity of God, and the subordination of Christ to the Father.

The future promises a union between these Transylvanian churches and the English Unitarians, different from the past. The subscription of £1,200, raised in England last year, to aid them, sent in the hands of our own dear and lamented Tagart, one of our ministers in London, who volunteered, at his own cost, to visit these churches, and which cost him his life in his homeward journey. This sympathy manifested for them in England, and the death of our good messenger in that mission; the residence, too, of an English Unitarian among them, Mr. Paget, deeply interested in them; and the probability of their most promising students coming to our Unitarian College, London, instead of going to Berlin to finish their studies, are hopeful signs that we will know each other better in the future. The following are a few of the remarks made by Miss Tagart, who accompanied her father among them last year.—“We attended the church built sixty years ago in honour of the ONE GOD. . . . The services are very short during the winter: they do not warm their churches. . . . The sermons are always either committed to memory or preached extemporarily. . . . The Lutherans are on friendly terms with the Unitarians. . . . The professors impressed my father as beings simple-minded, honest men. . . . They prize highly English and American works on Theology. . . . There prevails among them a very great respect for all the institutions and customs of this country; it would therefore be a great advantage to the Colleges that its future professors should have studied in England.”

THE QUAKER'S CORN-CRIB.

A MAN had been in the habit of stealing corn from his neighbour, who was a Quaker. Every night he would go softly to the crib and fill his bag with the ears which the good old Quaker's toil had placed there. Every morning the old

gentleman observed a diminution of his corn-pile. This was very annoying, and must be stopped,—but how? Many a one would have said, “Take a gun, conceal yourself, wait till he comes, and fire.” Others would have said, “Catch the villain and have him sent to jail.”

But the Quaker was not prepared to enter into any such severe measures. He wanted to punish the offender, and at the same time bring about his reformation, if possible. So he fixed a sort of trap close to the hole through which the man would thrust his arm in getting the corn.

The wicked neighbour proceeded on his unholy errand at the hour of midnight, with bag in hand. Unsuspectingly, he thrust his hand into the crib to seize an ear, when lo! he found himself unable to withdraw it! In vain he tugged, and pulled, and sweated, and alternately cried and cursed. His hand was fast, and every effort to release it only made it the more secure. After a time the tumult in his breast measurably subsided. He gave over his useless struggles, and began to look around him. All was silence and repose. Good men were sleeping comfortably in their beds, while he was compelled to keep a dreary, disgraceful watch through the remainder of that long and tedious night, his hand in constant pain from the pressure of the clamp which held it. His tired limbs, compelled to sustain his weary body, would fain have sunk beneath him, and his heavy eyes would have closed in slumber, but lo! there was no rest, no sleep for him. There he must stand and watch the progress of the night, and at once desire and dread the return of morning. Morning came at last, and the Quaker looked out of his window, and found that he had “caught his man.”

What was to be done? Some would say, “Go out and give him a good cow-hiding just as he stands, and then release him; that’ll cure him.” But not so said the Quaker. Such a course would have sent the man away embittered, and muttering curses of revenge. The good old man hurried on his clothes, and started at once to the relief and punishment of his prisoner.

“Good morning, friend,” said he, as

he came in speaking distance. “How does thee do?”

The poor culprit made no answer, but burst into tears.

“O fie!” said the Quaker, as he proceeded to release him. “I’m sorry that thou hast got thy hand fast. Thou put it in the wrong place, or it would not have been so.”

The man looked crestfallen, and, begging forgiveness, hastily turned to make his retreat. “Stay,” said his persecutor,—for he was now becoming such to the offender, who could have received a blow with much better grace than the kind words that were falling from the Quaker’s lips,—“Stay, friend, thy bag is not filled. Thou needest corn, or thou wouldst not have taken so much pains to get it. Come, let us fill it.” And the poor fellow was obliged to stand and hold the bag while the old man filled it, interspersing the exercises with the pleasantest conversation imaginable,—all of which were like daggers in the heart of his chagrined and mortified victim. The bag was filled, the string tied, and the sufferer hoped soon to be out of the presence of his tormentor; but again his purpose was thwarted.

“Stay,” said the Quaker, as the man was about to hurry off, having muttered once more his apologies and thanks. “Stay, Ruth has breakfast ere this; thou must not think of going without breakfast. Come, Ruth is calling!”

This was almost unendurable! This was “heaping coals” with a vengeance! In vain the mortified neighbour begged to be excused; in vain he pleaded to be released from what would be to him a punishment ten times more severe than stripes and imprisonment. The Quaker was inexorable, and he was obliged to yield.

Breakfast over, “Now,” said the old farmer, as he helped the victim to shoulder the bag, “If thou needest any more corn, come in the daytime, and thou shalt have it.”

With what shame and remorse did that guilty man turn from the dwelling of the pious Quaker! Everybody is ready to say that he never again troubled the Quaker’s corn-crib. I have something still better than that to tell you. He at once repented and reformed.

EXPLANATIONS OF SCRIPTURAL TEXTS ADVANCED TO SUSTAIN UN- SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES.

ORIGINAL SIN.

"No DOCTRINE is admissible, or can be established from the Scriptures, that is either repugnant to them, or contrary to reason, or to the analogy of faith. The different parts of a revelation which come from God must all be reconcilable with one another, and with sound reason. When easy and natural interpretations offer themselves, those interpretations ought to be avoided which deduce astonishing and incredible doctrines."—H. HOBBS, a clergyman of the Church of England.

"The popular impression is, that grace is designed to change men from nature. No. They are sinful, simply because they have deviated from their true nature, or fallen short of it."—Rev. H. W. BEECHER.

"Is man in nature as God originally designed, or is he not. If as designed, did God make him corrupt. If not as designed, who prevented God from finishing his work as intended. How did Adam fall without any original corruption of his nature, so called. If God decrees us to be born sinners, does he not make us sinners, and then where is his goodness."—Rev. F. BLAKELEY.

[We beg to observe that the following passages conclude the section on Original Sin. We believe there is not one passage in Holy Writ advanced to sustain this doctrine, but will be found given up by some Trinitarian commentators. We shall feel obliged to our readers, who have by them any such concessions or explanations of the passages in this and the other sections of texts, to send them to us; for nothing can be more valuable to confront the using of such texts than expositions harmonizing with our views, from Trinitarian critics. Wilson's Concessions of Trinitarians on passages for "*The Trinity and Deity of Christ*" are invaluable. By the aid of our many readers, we hope, to be able to collect similar concessions on all other doctrines. We purpose reprinting these explanations, with such additions and alterations as will make it a useful pamphlet in every Unitarian family, and then present one to each subscriber when completed.]

"For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt."—Job xi. 12.

This certainly describes man at his birth; but we do not see what service it renders to the doctrine of original sin. It says, "man is born a wild ass's colt." The word *like* is added to the text. We do not think there is much sinfulness about a "colt." There may not be much wisdom; and we grant, without demur, there is not much knowledge or wisdom about man at his birth. Eminent scholars say the original of this text is very difficult and obscure. Nothing should be built upon it.

"What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous? Behold, he putteth no trust in his saints; yea the heavens are not clean in his sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man, which drinketh iniquity like water?" . . .

"How then can man be justified with God, or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold even to the moon, and it shineth not;

yea the stars are not pure in his sight. How much less man, that is a worm? and the son of man which is a worm?"—Job. xv. 14, 15, 16.—xxv. 4, 5, 6.

The book of Job is a dialogue between Job and his companions, in which, in turns, they controvert each others statements. Job has asserted his "cleanness," "purity;" his companions affirm the contrary. Eliphaz and Bildad are the speakers in the citations just given. Their words are highly figurative and occasionally exaggerations. When they speak of the stars being not pure, or the heavens not clean, which things are not literally true, can we wonder, in referring to man, that they should state he is not clean. That because man is born of a woman, or he is the son of man, affords no reason for the conclusion that man is born depraved. The 16th verse is the character of a bad man, who hungers and thirsts after sin, *not* the character of a man who hungers and thirsts after righteousness. Many such good men, we rejoice to believe, are to be found among Christians, Jews, and heathens. Men should be careful in citing the words of either Eliphaz or Bildad, to uphold any supposed Christian doctrine. Of Bildad, Dr. A. Clarke says, immediately after the words we are commenting on: "Thus ended Bildad the Shuhite, who endeavoured to speak on a subject which he did not understand, and having got on bad ground was soon confounded in his own mind, spoke incoherently, argued inconclusively, and came abruptly and suddenly to an end." The book of Job should be read with carefulness, and we should always know whose words we are citing, for herein are the words of God, of Job, his companions, and also the words of Satan. No one will say they are all equal authorities.

"For there is not a just man upon the earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not."—Eccles. vii. 20.

We will give the note of an eminent Trinitarian on this passage.—"There is not a man upon earth, however just he may be, and habituated to do good, but is liable to commit sin." We go a little further than he does, and say, there is not a man, however good, but has sinned. "We have all sinned." Adam sinned without inborn corruption. Why may not all sin without inborn corruption?

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all righteousness."—Romans i. 28.

Part of this chapter, and other chapters of this book, are descriptive of the heathen world; and however dark and bad they are, it is never intimated they were born so, but the reverse. In the text before us they are blamed, because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, and because they are without excuse, a person born in sin has excuse. The 22nd verse says, "They became fools;" the 21st verse says, "They knew God," and they are censured for

not glorifying him as God, and for *becoming* vain in their imaginations. And it is further said that, consequently, on personal sin and folly, not innate corruption, God gave them up to sin.

"We have before proved, both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin."—Rom. iii. 9. "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin."—Gal. iii. 22.

Nothing in these passages to support our sinfulness and guilt at our birth. It is notoriously true that all mankind stand guilty before God: but not on Adam's sin, but our own. St. Paul shows that Jews and Gentiles all require the mercy of God, "for all have sinned."

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. . . . Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come."—Rom. v. 12, 14.

It is wrong, at any time, to pick out a text and dissever it from the argument in which it stands: so it is in the epistle to the Romans. Many of the passages are very difficult of explanation. No commentator has received the commendation Dr. Taylor has for his exposition of this difficult epistle. We will give his words on the passage and whole argument, from which this text is taken. "The consequences of Christ's obedience extend as far as the consequences of Adam's disobedience. The consequences of Adam's disobedience extend to all mankind; and therefore so do the consequences of Christ's obedience. Now, if the Jews will not allow the Gentiles any interest in Abraham, as not being naturally descended from him, yet they must own that the Gentiles are descendants of Adam, as well as themselves; and being all equally involved in the consequences of his sin, from which (as far as the death of the body is concerned) they shall all equally be released at the resurrection, through the free gift of God." Read the whole chapter, and this you'll perceive to be the meaning. We see nothing in this text about inborn sin, but rather, that all have sinned.

"Therefore as by the offence of one judgment, came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."—Rom. v. 18, 19.

This passage seems clearly to state what *all* mankind lose in Adam, *all* mankind gain in Christ. Adam's disobedience makes *many* sinners—Christ's obedience makes *many* righteous. The first statements of what we lose in Adam should always have joined to it our gain in Christ. We do not profess to fully understand the passage, or to give its certain meaning. Does any one conclude from it, because of Adam's sin, we are *all* born sinners? Then there is the same reason for concluding, because of Christ's

obedience we are *all* born righteous. If debt is contracted by Adam's disobedience, the passage teaches it is cancelled by Christ's obedience. If in Adam *all* die—in Christ *all* are made alive.

"The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God."—Rom. viii. 7.

This is undeniably true, that a sinful state of mind is at war with God. The word carnal is so used, to express lowest passions. We have been always taught that God made us, body, soul, and spirit. It would be a great reflection on him to say he made us to be at enmity with him. Sin is *our* fault, not God's design.

"But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."—1 Cor. ii. 14.

The terms "natural man" have no reference to man in a state of nature. We have before us the rendering of this text by believers in Original Sin. Their words are, "The animal man," "The man who lives under the influence of low animal passions." The man who lives to satisfy mere animal passion is ignorant of spiritual life. The Rev. H. W. Beecher says, "The popular impression is, that grace is designed to change men *from* nature. No. They are sinful, simply because they have deviated from their true nature, or fallen short of it."

"For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."—1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.

This passage speaks of *death* being introduced by one man, Adam, and of life being introduced by Jesus Christ. There is not the smallest intimation of universal sinfulness, through Adam's transgression.

"Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others."—Ephesians ii. 3.

The words, *by nature*, in the text, mean by situation, condition, or circumstance of birth, which do not apply to all mankind. Not to children of a Christian country and a Christian family. It is specially addressed to people born and educated in idolatrous Ephesus. By many of the best commentators and critics, Trinitarian too, is this conceded. Schleusner, in his Lexicon, says, under the word *physis*, rendered nature; "In this place it signifies, as the whole context indicates, the state and condition of those who have not yet been improved, and informed by the Christian religion. The meaning of St. Paul," he says "in this text evidently is, that both he and the Ephesian converts, before their knowledge and reception of Christianity, were in a fatal state of ignorance and error, together with the rest of the world; all being in sin, were liable to those punishments God has annexed to a sinful life." That man-

kind are born sinners the Apostle nowhere says. In truth, at Athens, he confirmed the saying of a Greek poet, "We are all the offspring of God."

"That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

—Eph. ii. 12. "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart."—Eph. iv. 18.

This passage portrays the state of the heathen generally, contrasted with the privileges of the Gospel dispensation. There is not one word in all these representations about the hereditary corruption of the heathen. Our modern divines can never speak of the heathen without naming Adam's fall, and all therefore corrupt from their birth. How Paul could so frequently speak of heathen darkness, without naming once their inborn corruption, can only be accounted for by the fact that St. Paul knew nothing of the doctrine of Original Sin. Could a Christian speak, for any length of time, at present, on the improved state of the world, without referring to its cause, the Gospel; or could it be possible that St. Paul could so often depict heathen wickedness, if he knew that its source was in original sin, and yet never once refer to inborn corruptness in all his writings. St. Paul's epistles are a demonstration *original sin* was unknown to the early church.

"That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts."—Eph. iv. 22. "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him."—Col. iii. 9, 10.

St. Paul here teaches the Christian converts to abandon their old mode of living, which he calls the "*old man*," and to adopt a new mode of living, as they have professed adoption of a new faith, which he calls the "*new man*." They strain the passages who say the *old man* means the inherited evil nature from Adam.

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us."—1 John i. 8.

We all confess *we* have sinned, but we see nothing in the text advanced about us being born sinners. In short, sin is the transgression of the law, and therefore we could have transgressed no law at the time of our birth, and could not be born sinners.

"Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, the spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?"

—James iv. 5.

It is a much easier thing to repeat this passage than to say what it means. Dr. Clarke says, "there is not a critic in Europe who has considered the passage and has not been puzzled with it." He thinks it may mean the Holy Spirit which dwells in Christians will not excite them to envy others.

"Naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves."—Jude 10th verse.

Read the whole chapter, and it is clear, beyond controversy, that this refers not to the whole race of man, but, as the 4th verse says, "*To certain men*." The 18th and 19th verses refer this to sensual men, who walk after their own ungodly lusts. The words, in fact, do not speak of these men being born corrupt, but they "*corrupt themselves*." First, middle, and last of all passages quoted from to support the doctrine of Original Sin are short of the very element which would make them evidence on the question; they never state that mankind are born corrupt, but that they "*corrupt themselves*." It is this and this only which makes sin; for, by birth, we are pure, spotless, "Such as the kingdom of heaven;" so Christ said of infancy. It is this fact, that mankind "*corrupt their own ways*," which makes sin an evil and deserving punishment.

TWENTY REASONS FOR REJECTING THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

1. Because the doctrine teaches that all mankind are born "Wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of both soul and body," and that "So long as men are in their natural state they not only have no good thing, but that it is impossible that they should have or do any good thing." Now our consciousness, the highest evidence we possess, of our state in childhood, gives the lie to such a view of what is called our "unregenerate and natural condition." We believe the hearts of the best of men, and the worst of men, and all men, can bear witness that this is a calumny on human nature and infancy.

2. Because the account of Adam's disobedience, in the book of Genesis, declares the change which took place in man's mental and moral condition in these words, "And the Lord said, behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil;" and that this does not suggest the idea that man had become morally corrupt in his nature.

3. Because the evil consequences of Adam's disobedience are stated to him by God; and no mention whatever is made of the future inborn depravity of the human race, which would have been the most terrible of all calamities; yet there is not one hint of such a penalty for the first transgression.

4. Because the Scriptures very distinctly teach whatever we may have lost by the disobedience of Adam, we gain by the obedience of Christ. *Sin* and *death* are said to be by Adam; *life* and *righteousness* by Christ.

5. Because the Bible teaches "That God hath made us and not we ourselves;" "Thy hands have made me and fashioned me;" "The breath of the Almighty hath given him life," "The

inspiration of the Almighty giveth man understanding;" "God hates a wicked and deceitful heart." Then for God to make what he hates seems inconsistent with his wisdom and goodness.

6. Because the Bible teaches "That God made man in his own image and likeness." And after the disobedience of Adam this is not revoked, but re-affirmed. "In the image of God made he man."—Gen. ix. 6. "Man is the image and glory of God."—1 Cor. xi. 7. "Man . . . made after the similitude of God."—James iii. 9.

7. Because the words "*original sin*" are not found in the Scriptures, nor any of the words used by theologians to express what it implies, "*Inborn corruption*," "*hereditary depravity*," "*innate sinfulness*," "*by nature unholy*," "*born guilty*," etc., etc. These are all un-Scriptural phrases, and contrary to the doctrine that a pure and holy God has made us.

8. Because the doctrine that affirms "all are guilty for Adam's sin," is opposed to the justice and clearest statements of the Bible. "The Son shall not bear the iniquity of the father;" "For every man shall bear his own burden." "Behold, all souls are mine;" as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

9. Because the doctrine of Original Sin speaks of little children as "Heirs of hell and children of the devil;" while the Saviour took the little children up in his arms, blessed them, and said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and, also, said, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in nowise enter therein."

10. Because the Apostle Paul teaches that men, in their natural state, do good things. "When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves, which shew the work of the law written in their hearts; their conscience, also, bearing witness; and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another."—Rom. ii. 14, 15.

11. Because all Christians believe that God created Adam *spotless* in his nature, and gave him only *one command*, and he fell without any original sin; therefore the sin in the world has not its source in inborn corruption, nor for its continuance is it necessary that man be born depraved. As Adam sinned without any original corruption, so may all men sin without hereditary depravity.

12. Because we believe that the nature of man is just as God designed it, and that sinfulness is a deviation from true nature; and that the conscience, bearing witness against wrong doing, at all times, from childhood to manhood, is evidence of the truthfulness of this position. A state of sinfulness is a state of uneasiness,—the unrest of the soul.

13. Because the whole question of *original sin* hinges on our *birth condition*, which makes it totally depraved, and therefore incapable of greater badness. Whereas the Apostle Paul says, "In malice be ye children;" that is, have no more than childhood. And the common experience of all mankind is, that the greatest depths of evil are utterly unknown to a child.

14. Because there is not a text in the Bible that speaks of mankind in general as being born in sin, or born depraved; that all proof texts cited for the doctrine are special in their reference to some one individual or people; and that a state of general wickedness does not prove total or innate depravity; for the ascription in Deuteronomy, xivth chapter, 2nd verse, and other parts of the Bible to the Jewish people. "*For thou art a HOLY people unto the Lord thy God*," proves not the universal holiness of this nation, or of all people."

15. Because in many of the passages cited to uphold this doctrine, the persons to whom they refer are blamed for "*corrupting themselves*," and "*becoming filthy*," "*gone aside*," etc., which could not be true, if they were so from their birth. There is not one text where man is condemned for birth sin; but for personal sin, and for that only, is he justly held responsible.

16. Because neither in the *law*, the *prophets*, the *gospels*, or the *epistles*, where sin is so often spoken of and condemned, are sinners told, as they are in those days, they were born corrupt and incapable in themselves of doing any good thing. "The barbarians," says St. Paul, "showed us no little kindness."

17. Because the Bible teaches that "Sin is the transgression of the law," and at birth we have transgressed no law, nor are liable to transgress, nor disposed to transgress. Neither is the liability or disposition accounted sin, if we successfully contend in after years against the temptations without and the proneness within. It is a complete perversion of language to talk of the sin and guilt of a baby.

18. Because the doctrine of innate depravity gives a license to a sinful way of life, in offering a palliation for a course of crime, in the confession—"I was born with a sinful and corrupt nature, which was no fault of mine, and I therefore could no more help *sinning* in such a state, than I could help *seeing*; both being natural conditions."

19. Because the doctrine of *birth purity*, *innocency*, a *nature from God*, records its condemnation against all sinfulness as rebellion against the designs of God in our moral nature and constitution, and urges us on to the abandonment of every evil passion, as contrary to the will of God, testified in the Holy Scriptures and human conscience.

20. Because we believe that depravity is the result of a course of sinfulness. Man sins because he is capable of it from moral agency, and his first acts in general are most strongly rebuked by conscience. Sin, formed into a habit, gives less pain, *this is depravity*, caused by sin; the sin was not caused by inborn depravity, the depravity was caused by sinning. Moral agency is sufficient to account for all sin. If man could not sin, he would not be a moral agent; yet moral agency does not imply the necessity of sinning, every man's experience must testify. A nature *totally corrupt* could do no good thing, and implies the necessity of sinning. The doctrine of hereditary depravity is contrary to all moral evidence, and human experience, and the clearest statements of Holy Scripture, therefore we reject it.

WAYSIDE GATHERINGS.

THE SYNAGOGUE.—It is said that the Jewish nation, dispersed in almost every part of the globe, without forming anywhere an independent nation, numbers 4,690,000 persons.

LIGHTNING AND LOTTERIES.—A Statistician has carefully noted down the number of persons struck by lightning in one year, and compared it with those who had drawn prizes in lotteries for the same period, arriving at the conclusion that three persons were struck by lightning to one who had drawn a prize. Rather encouraging that to lottery adventurers.

THE oldest minister of the Society of Friends is Mrs. Mary Wright. She is now 103 years old, and at the last quarterly meeting at Leeds she stood up and began to preach, but finding a standing position painful, she sat down, and continued preaching for about twenty minutes; her voice was clear and distinct, and her sermon in some parts of it, said to be truly impressive.

REVIVALISM.—The Philadelphia correspondent of the New York *Christian Advocate*, speaking of the "union prayer-meetings" in this city, says, "The Methodist Church has reaped but small increase from them. This is owing, in part, to the fact that they fall below our standard of spiritual excitement. *We cannot do much in revival meetings where there is no mourner's bench nor shouting.* They are our sling and our stone, and we can fight with them better than in Saul's armor."—*Banner*.

A SECT UNKNOWN IN BOWER.—During his recent visit to this country, Mr. Brownlow North took frequent opportunities of visiting aged and infirm individuals, and conversing with them on religious topics. One day, while in Bower, he called on an old woman, and after announcing the object of his visit, the following conversation occurred:—Old Woman: "And fat's yir name, gif ye please?" Mr. North: "My name is North." "And fat kirk dive ye belong till." "I belong to the Church of Christ, my good woman." "Ochane, bairn, there's name o' that sec hereaways; we're a' Free Kirk or Moderates."—*Northern Ensign*.

TO HUSBANDS AND WIVES.—The last word is the most dangerous of infernal machines. Husband and wife should no more strive to get it than they would struggle for the possession of a lighted bomb-shell. Married people should study each other's weak points, as skaters look after the weak parts of the ice, in order to keep off them. Ladies who marry for love should remember that the union of angels with women has been forbidden since the flood. The wife is the sun of the social system. Unless she attracts, there is nothing to keep heavy bodies like husbands, from flying off into space. The wife who would properly discharge her duties must never have a soul "above buttons." Don't trust too much to good temper when you get into an argument. Sugar is the substance most universally diffused through all natural products! Let married people take the hint from this provision of nature.

A SIGNIFICANT PASSAGE.—A writer in the November number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, tells his readers that "a man may brutalize himself by a contemplation of theological cruelties, until decent parents are ashamed to have their children listen to his libels on the Father of All."

COMING TO CONSCIENCE.—A minister was about to leave his own congregation for the purpose of visiting London, on what was by no means a pleasant errand—to beg on behalf of his place of worship. Previous to his departure he called the principal persons connected with his charge, and said to them, "Now I shall be asked, whether we have conscientiously done all that we can for the removal of this debt; what answer am I to give? Brother So-and-so, can you in conscience say that you have?" "Why, sir," he replied, "if you come to conscience, I don't know that I can." The same question he put to a second and a third, and so on, and similar answers were returned, till the whole sum required was subscribed, and there was no longer any need of their pastor's wearing out his soul in coming to London on any such unpleasant excursion.

THE HOOPED SKIRT AND BAPTISM.—A rather amusing scene took place, during the baptism of a young lady. The *Union* says: "The minister requested her to assume the dress peculiar to such an occasion, but she declined to take off her hooped skirt. The minister told her of the inconvenience that must result from her obstinacy, but, like a true female, she persisted. But, when she came to descend into the bath, the inflated skirt touched the water and rose up round her like a balloon. Her head was lost to the congregation—she was swallowed up in the swelling skirt. The minister tried to force her down into the bath, but she was kept above the surface by the floating properties of crinoline, and was buoyed up so successfully that it was not until after much difficulty, and many forcible attempts to submerge the lady, the minister succeeded in baptizing the fair one. Finally it was effected, to the relief of the minister and the seriously-inclined audience."

The CHRISTIAN FREEMAN will contain, in 1859, an Exposition of the SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES advanced for Original Sin; A Triune-deity; Calvinistic Election; Deity of Christ; Imputed Righteousness; Vicarious Sacrifice; Personality of the Holy Ghost; Justification by Faith; A Personal Devil; Eternal Torments. Also a Sketch of SEVEN Christian Denominations holding Unitarian Sentiments:—the 1. Transylvanian Unitarians; 2. English Unitarians; 3. Irish Unitarians; 4. American Unitarians; 5. Christians of America. 6. Hicksites; or Quakers of America. 7. Universalists.—One copy will be sent to any part of the United Kingdom, Monthly, post free, at 2s. 6d. per Annum. Four copies, post free, at 6d. per Month, or 6s. per Annum. Nine copies, post free, 1s. per month, or 12s. per Annum.

All Letters, Post-Office Orders, &c., to be addressed to ROBERT SPEARS, Stockton-on-Tees.

Printed by W. ROBINSON, High-street, Stockton.